

REMARKS

This is a response to the Office Action mailed on June 20, 2006, in this application. Claims 1-10, 14-20, 24 and 33-39 are presented for examination. Claims 1, 2, 14, 15, 24, 33, and 36 are currently amended. Claims 11-13, 21-23, and 25-32 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. It is respectfully submitted that the amendments do not introduce new matter. Individual issues raised in the Office Action are addressed next.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claims 11-13, 21-23, and 25-32 have been cancelled. The rejections of these claims are therefore moot, and should be withdrawn. The remaining claims have been carefully reviewed and amended as deemed necessary to ensure that they fully conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, with special attention to the points raised in the Office Action. It is believed that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, have been thereby obviated, and their withdrawal is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsujimoto *et al.* (2002/0190896) in view of Yamazaki (6,919,841). In making this rejection, the Examiner further cited Richton *et al.* (6,570,529).

Tsujimoto discloses a technology that “supports all kinds of geolocation services, from fully standalone mode, network aided mode, to network based service mode, to other service modes.” Para. 0025. Yamazaki discloses connecting a standalone GPS receiver and an assisted GPS receiver to the same antenna. Fig. 2. Richton discloses methods and systems for associating characteristics of the wireless signal as received at a mobile, such as Mobile Associated Handoff information, or Timing Advance information, with reliable location data, such as GPS location data, in order to populate and calibrate a database that can then be used for positioning based on the received wireless signal characteristics.

However, neither Tsujimoto, Yamazaki, nor Richton, alone or in combination, teach, disclose, or suggest all the features of the claims under examination. For example, the cited

references, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest any features related to transmitting a signal for use in optimizing the Maximum Antenna Range Set (MAR) for a base station.

In this regard, the Examiner's attention is directed to the final limitation of independent claim 1, which reads:

a wireless modem for modulating the C-GPS geolocation information and the A-GPS data, generating and transmitting a MAR optimizing data signal for use in optimizing the MAR, wherein the MAR optimizing data signal comprises the C-GPS geolocation information obtained in the C-GPS operation mode and the A-GPS data obtained in the A-GPS operation mode.

Nothing in the cited references, alone or in combination, discloses or suggests what is claimed in claim 1, namely a modem for generating and transmitting a MAR optimizing signal comprising C-GPS information and A-GPS data. Applicant therefore submits that claim 1 is patentable over any combination of the cited references, and that the rejection should therefore be withdrawn. As claims 2-10 and 14 are dependent claims depending from claim 1, they are patentable for at least this reason and the rejections of these claims should be withdrawn.

Independent claim 15 comprises the identical limitation cited above regarding claim 1. As noted above, the cited references, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest this limitation. Applicant submits that independent claim 15 is therefore also patentable over any combination of the cited references, and that the rejections of these claims should also be withdrawn. Further, as dependent claims 16-20 and 24 depend from claim 15, applicant submits that they are patentable for at least this reason and that the rejections of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Also, the Examiner's attention is directed to step (f) of independent method claim 33, which reads:

(f) gathering the C-GPS geolocation information and the A-GPS data, and transmitting the C-GPS geolocation information and the A-GPS data as a MAR optimizing data for use in optimizing the MAR to the position determination entity through the mobile communication networks.

Nothing in the cited references, alone or in combination, discloses or suggests what is claimed in claim 33, namely transmitting a MAR optimizing data comprising C-GPS

information and A-GPS data. Applicant therefore submits that claim 33 is patentable over any combination of the cited references, and that the rejection should therefore be withdrawn. As claims 34-39 are dependent claims depending from claim 33, they are patentable for at least this reason and the rejections of these claims should be withdrawn.

As claims 11-13, 21-23, and 25-32 have been cancelled, the rejections of these claims are moot and should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the above, applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. A favorable disposition to that effect is respectfully requested.

No fee is believed to be due for this submission. In the event a fee is required please charge such a fee to Jones Day Deposit Account No. 50-3013.

Should the Examiner have any questions or comments concerning this submission, he is invited to call the undersigned at the phone number listed below.

Date: September 19, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



For Brian M. Rothery (Reg. No. 35,340)

By Lawrence R. Gabuzda (Reg. No. 51,711)

JONES DAY

222 East 41st Street

New York, New York 10017

(212) 326-3939